

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,094	07/25/2000	Frederick M. Discenzo	00RE089	6257
75	90 10/05/2004		EXAM	NER
Allen-Bradley Company Inc			LEE, HWA S	
Attention John J Horn Patent Dept 704P Floor 8 T-29			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1201 South Second Street			2877	
Milwaukee, WI 53204			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	09/625,094	DISCENZO, FREDERICK M.	
navicery neutrin	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Hwa S. Lee	2877	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>13 September 2004</u> . 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment	
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b)□ disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			
10. Other:		ndrew Hwa S. Lee	
	A,	ndrew Hwa S. Lee	

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments generally repeat the previous arguments. To demonstrate to the applicant that it is of general knowledge to skilled artisan that an interferometric fiber optic temperature sensor is more accurate than a thermocouple, please see U5 5,473,428 column 1, lines 24+.